



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/748,782	12/29/2003	Bruce G. Cortez	ATT 2003-0040	8712
26652	7590	07/24/2008	EXAMINER	
AT&T CORP.			JUNTIMA, NITTAYA	
ROOM 2A207				
ONE AT&T WAY			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BEDMINSTER, NJ 07921			2616	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/24/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/748,782	CORTEZ ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	NITTAYA JUNTIMA	2616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 April 2008.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on 4/22/2008.
2. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.
3. Claims 1-5 and 7-11 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

**Claim 6** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 6, even though the list of steps is to be read in no particular order, note that “said network event” in the step of identifying refers to the network event in the step of receiving, the affected circuits in the step of grouping refers to the affected circuits in the step of identifying. Therefore, given the way claim 1 is drafted, one would have to read the steps in a sequence as currently recited in claim 1. Based on the steps of claim 1, it is logically unclear in claim 6 how the steps of identifying and grouping which *depend* from the step of receiving can be performed *prior* to the step of receiving as claimed. Therefore, claim 6 is vague and indefinite.

In addition, it appears that claims 1 and 6 are two mutually exclusive embodiments (i.e., claim 1 having the steps of identifying and grouping performed after the step of receiving, and

claim 6 having the steps of identifying and grouping performed prior to the step of receiving), therefore, they must be claimed independently.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. **Claims 1-5 and 7-11** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Doshi (US 2004/0008619 A1).

Regarding **claim 1**, as shown in Fig. 2, Doshi teaches a method of reducing signaling load in a communication network (network 100 in Fig. 1) having a plurality of switches (A-D, paragraph 004), said method comprising the steps of:

- a) Receiving notification of a network event (step 202, node A receives connection requests, which are tear-down requests for connections in node B associated with the path A-B-C, constituting receiving notification of a network event, paragraph 0027).
- b) Identifying a plurality of circuits affected by said network event (node A must identify the connections to be torn down related to node B as stated in the received requests, paragraphs 0027-0028).

c) Grouping affected circuits in accordance with one end-switch (node B) to which a plurality of signaling messages have to be sent (in node A must group the connections on link 1 connecting node A to node B to which the connections requests/tear-down requests have to be sent, paragraphs 0027-0028 and Fig. 1).

d) Bundling said plurality of signaling messages (in step 204, node A bundles the connections requests/tear-down requests to be sent to node B into a single message, paragraph 0028).

Regarding **claim 2**, Doshi also teaches e) forwarding said bundled signaling messages to one of said plurality of switches (in step 206, the bundled connections requests/tear-down requests in a single message are forwarded to node B, paragraph 0028).

Regarding **claim 3**, Doshi also teaches that wherein said forwarding step e) forwards said bundled signaling messages in at least one signaling packet (paragraph 0028).

Regarding **claim 4**, Doshi also teaches that wherein said forwarding step e) forwards said bundled signaling messages for circuits with a common end switch (node B, Fig. 1). See paragraph 0028.

Regarding **claim 5**, Doshi teaches that wherein said signaling messages are release message (tear-down requests, paragraph 0027).

Regarding **claim 7**, Doshi also teaches that wherein said forwarding step e) forwards said bundled signaling messages for circuits with a common end switch (node B) along a common path (link 1, Fig. 1), see paragraphs 0027-0028.

**Claims 8, 9, and 10** are apparatus claims corresponding to method claims 1, 2, and 4, respectively, and are therefore rejected under the same reason set forth in the rejection of claims 1, 2, and 4, respectively with an addition of controller (inherent processor at node A for controlling and performing the method steps set forth in claims 1, 2, and 4, respectively).

**Claim 11** is a computer-readable medium corresponding to method claim 1 and is therefore rejected under the same reason set forth in the rejection of claim 1 (see also paragraph 0055).

#### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed 4/22/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

A. In the remarks, the applicant argues that Doshi fails to teach identifying a plurality of circuits affected by a network event and grouping affected circuits in accordance with one or more end-switches to which a plurality of signaling messages have to be sent.

In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Doshi clearly teaches that after a plurality of connection requests, i.e., tear-down requests for tearing down of connections in node

B to support the transmission of signals from node A to node C along path A->B->C), are received at node A (paragraph 0027 and Fig. 2), node A bundles the connection, tear-down, requests into a single message and transmits the resulting bundled message to node B (paragraph 0028 and Fig. 2).

Therefore, node A must identify the connections, i.e., affected circuits, to be torn down related to node B as stated in the received tear-down requests when it reads/processes the received tear-down requests before bundling them into one message (*corresponding to the step of identifying a plurality of circuits affected by said network event*).

In addition, as node A bundles the connections, i.e., tear-down, requests concerning node B into a single message, node A groups the connections, i.e., affected circuits, on link 1 in Fig. 1 connecting node A to node B to which the tear-down requests have to be sent (*corresponding to the step of grouping affected circuits in accordance with one end-switch (node B) to which a plurality of signaling messages have to be sent*).

So it is clear from paragraphs 0027 and 0028 of Doshi that multiple affected connections/circuits to be torn down in node B over the same A->B->C path are handled by one bundled message.

Note that the argument relating to Doshi's teaching in paragraphs 0030-0031 and Fig. 3 is irrelevant because those paragraphs and Fig. 3 are related to the restoration process which are not relied upon in the rejection of claim 1.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the steps of identifying and grouping are met by Doshi and the rejection is maintained.

***Conclusion***

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NITTAYA JUNTIMA whose telephone number is (571)272-3120. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:00 A.M - 5:00 P.M. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Firmin Backer can be reached on 571-272-6703. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Nittaya Juntima/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2616  
7/21/2008

/FIRMIN BACKER/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2616